

東洋大学学術情報リポジトリ Toyo University Repository for Academic Resources

# ロビーイングと政策分析      マクロ実践における政策実践モデル

著者	戸井 宏紀
著者別名	TOI Hiroki
雑誌名	ライフデザイン学研究
巻	14
ページ	121-138
発行年	2019-03
URL	<a href="http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00010708/">http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00010708/</a>

# ロビーイングと政策分析

## —マクロ実践における政策実践モデル—

Lobbying and policy analysis  
— Policy practice models in macro practice —

戸 井 宏 紀  
TOI Hiroki

### 要旨

本稿では、ソーシャルワークのマクロ実践における政策実践モデルである、ロビーイングと政策分析について比較検討を行う。米国を中心とした文献研究に基づき、ドロシー・ディックス、ジェーン・アダムズ、ジャネット・ランキンといったパイオニアが、ソーシャルワークにおけるロビーイングの初期形成に、大きく貢献してきたことを明らかにする。そして、近接諸科学の理論、知識、技術の発展が、ソーシャルワークの各領域における複合的な課題に対して、政策分析者がアプローチしていくための手法を開発していくことに、重要な役割を担ってきた経緯について言及する。歴史的な形成と同様に、これら二つの政策実践モデルは、固有の社会理論、経済理論、政治理論と認識論のもと、発展してきた。ロビーイングと政策分析はともに、ソーシャルワーカーが向き合う人びと、とりわけ周縁化された集団に属する人びとの社会正義を追求していくための、独自かつ有益な手段を提供する。ソーシャルワーカーは、政治・政策の領域においてロビーイングと政策分析を実践することによって、自らの実践において向き合う人びとのウェルビーイング実現のため、社会変革をもたらすことに、さらなる貢献が可能である。

キーワード：ロビーイング 政策分析 政策実践 マクロ実践

## Lobbying and policy analysis : Policy practice models in macro practice

TOI Hiroki

### **Abstract**

This paper examines and compares lobbying and policy analysis, focusing on two policy practice models in macro practice. The literature review revealed that several pioneers such as Dorothea Dix, Jane Addams, and Jeannette Rankin contributed to the initial foundation of lobbying in social work. The evolving theories, knowledge, and skills from interdisciplinary fields helped policy analysts develop methods to approach complex problems in the field of social work. Like the historical formation, the two models have been developed through distinct social, economic, and political theories and epistemologies. Both lobbying and policy analysis provide unique and useful tools for social workers to pursue social justice for their clients, especially for the marginalized population. Social workers can make further contributions into bringing about social change for their clients' well-being by implementing lobbying and policy analysis in the political arena.

**Keywords** : lobbying, policy analysis, policy practice, macro practice

This paper compares and contrasts lobbying and policy analysis, the two models in the policy practice method. The paper first explores the historical development of lobbying and policy analysis, and then reviews its basic assumptions. Dominant paradigms and potential applications of the chaos theory are addressed in each model. Relevant political, social, and economic theories that have contributed to the formation of lobbying and policy analysis are examined subsequently. Finally, epistemological and empirical considerations are discussed in terms of three different perspectives.

In this paper, lobbying is defined as a legitimate, fundamental, and powerful model in policy practice to influence legislative and public policy through direct access to lawmakers (Barker, 2003 ; Humphreys, 2012). Social work lobbying requires practitioners to engage in several steps : information gathering, building an agenda, engaging with legislators and influential officials, networking, coalition building, and testifying (Gitterman & Germain, 2008). On the other hand, policy analysis is defined as a set of technical skills used to describe, assess, and influence social policies. It also refers to a perspective about what government should do, based on an assessment of the circumstances and potential for interventions to make improvements (Einbinder, 1995). In addition, it is a rational, systematic and multidisciplinary activity with alternative solutions.

### **History**

#### **Lobbying**

Several pioneers such as Dorothea Dix, Jane Addams, and Jeannette Rankin contributed to the initial formation of lobbying in social work. Dorothea Dix helped to revolutionize mental health care in the 1840s and 50s as part of the profession's tradition. Her work predated the birth of social work in the United States. When she started her work through lobbying with a few fellow reformers, the overwhelming majority of people with mental illness were either placed in inadequate public mental institutions, or confined to jails, almshouses, and other institutions where their care and treatment were insufficient (Jansson, 2005). By visiting many institutions where the bulk of the people with mental illness were confined, she documented in detail all that she had seen (Trattner, 1999). Although Dix initially lobbied individual state governments to develop institutions to treat people with mental illness, her campaign became a national crusade as she traveled from state to state getting legislatures to build proper institutions (Linhorst, 2002). Between 1843 and 1853, indeed, "nine of 13 states she lobbied passed legislation approving development of the institutions" (Linhorst, 2002, p. 204).

In spite of her strenuous lobbying, a bill that authorized grants of public land to establish hospitals for people with mental illness initiated by Dix was vetoed by President Franklin Pierce in 1854 (Grob, 1983). However, she did not stop her fight because of the veto and she did not limit her work to the U.S. only. In response to the urgings of her friend, Dix went to Scotland and "lobbied for humane care of that country's mentally ill" (Richan, 1987, p.121). Dix continued to be an advocate for people with mental illness through lobbying until the age of eighty.

In the early 1900s, settlement house leaders like Jane Addams, Julia Lathrop, Florence Kelly, and Grace Abbott advocated for legislative reforms at the municipal, state and federal levels, addressing issues such as child labor, healthcare reforms and immigration policies. They also led the fight for better housing laws, shorter working hours, and improved working conditions for working-class neighbors. In addition, their research became the intellectual basis for some of the period's social legislations (Franklin, 1990 ; Rome & Kiser, 2017).

Jeannette Rankin, inspired by Jane Addams, also worked for social justice and peace. After graduating from the New York School of Philanthropy, she studied social legislation at the University of Washington. As a leading feminist and the first congresswoman, she still struggled to influence legislation to achieve woman's suffrage (Josephson, 1974 ; Smith, 2002). George Edmund Haynes, the first African American graduate of the New York School of Philanthropy and co-founder of the National Urban League, served as a special assistant to the Secretary of Department of Labor and he was involved in policy issues of racial conflict in employment, housing, and recreation (Pardeck & Meinert, 1994).

In the 1930s, social workers such as Harry Hopkins, Dorothy Kahn, and Frances Perkins "effected major social legislation and social planning in the New Deal era, including social security and the administration of expanded social welfare programs" (Schneider & Netting, 1999, p. 350). In the 1940s, Eduard Lindeman was accused of disloyalty for his civil rights activities and his attacks on McCarthyites for eroding civil liberties (Reisch & Andrews, 2001). He was also attempting "to engage social workers in a debate over policies such as health care, racism, education and employment, and democratic tradition of citizen participation" (Schneider & Netting, 1999, p. 351).

In 1955, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) was formed through the merger of five professional membership associations and two study groups. Since then, the NASW has assumed a central role to collectively influence state and federal legislations and advocate for clients' and societal well-being.

### **Policy Analysis**

Policy analysis was originally developed outside the field of social work. According to Hogwood and Gunn (1984), the publication of Lerner and Lasswell's *The Policy Sciences* (1951) marked an upsurge of interest in policy-focused analysis among social scientists. Especially, Lasswell envisioned a multidisciplinary enterprise capable of guiding the political decision processes of post-World War II industrial societies (Fischer, Miller, & Sidney, 2007). He called for the study of the role of "knowledge in and of the policy process" (p. xix). Lasswell learned from John Dewey, George Herbert Mead, and Charles E. Merriam, and he was to emerge as the outstanding representative of the Chicago School of Political Science by the 1930s (Torgerson, 2007). In his development of policy science, pragmatism explicitly played an important role. Lasswell (1971) notes that "policy sciences are a contemporary adaptation of general approach to

public policy that was recommended by John Dewey and his colleagues in the development of American pragmatism” (pp. xiii-xiv).

In conjunction with the development of policy science, policy analysis was conceptualized as a multidisciplinary activity. It formally grew from military research that included system analysis during the 1960s as a way to bring objective facts and knowledge to problem solvers (Einbinder, 2010). Policy analysis emerged to both better understand the policy making process and to supply policy decision makers with reliable policy-relevant knowledge about pressing economic and social problems over the past several decades (Fischer, Miller, & Sidney, 2007 ; Jansson, 2003). The field of policy analysis has its intellectual roots in several social science disciplines such as economics, political science, and sociology.

Economists make up the largest discipline represented within policy analysis and they view social problems predominantly from the market perspective. Their primary concern for analysis would be the allocation of resources among the government, the market, and households. They analyze market failures and government failures as well as the distributional effects of taxation and government expenditures. Political scientists are also represented among policy analysts and they view policies mainly from the government realm, since they are interested in how government operates at various levels and how government policies affect the market and general public. Sociologists conduct policy analysis by focusing on how social policies influence social institutions and social behavior. In addition to these social scientists, experts like public administration professionals, or public opinion pollsters are found among policy analysts (Einbinder, 1995, 2010).

Historically, policy analysis has been said to be a “niche” or “neglected” field as well as policy practice, social policy, and social welfare in social work (e.g., Burns, 1958 ; Figueira-McDonough, 1993 ; Holosko & Au, 1996 ; Specht, 1976). Like lobbying, the development of policy analysis in social work has been closely related to the profession’s commitment to influencing social policy over 100 years. Despite its rich history, it was not until the 1950s and 1960s that the development of policy analysis started to flourish by two forerunners, Eveline Burns and Richard Titmuss, and their successors in macro practice.

Eveline Burns, who helped design the US Social Security Act of 1935 as a member of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Committee on Economic Security, committed herself to social change through policy analysis and social policy curriculum development in the profession of social work (Burns, 1961). Burns formulated that policy analysis is the study of need, priority selection, the intervention of appropriate instruments for distributing benefits, the design of programs and administrative arrangements, and the assessment of results (Shlakman, 1969). She developed a model for policy analysis that is “a flexible and sensitive instrument for definition of the problem, location of the issues, and specification of the areas in which decisions must be made about what needs will be met by government, and on what terms” (Shlakman, 1969, p. 10). She led the

doctoral program in the New York School of Social work and her students invented the means to study, understand, analyze, explain, advocate for, and change social welfare policy (Humphreys, 2011).

Another early incorporation of policy analysis into social work was created by Richard M. Titmuss. He promoted the comparative analysis of social policy and presented three models of social policy : the residual welfare model, the industrial achievement-performance model, and the institutional redistributive model. Titmuss's three models for welfare provision "have underpinned most of the more recent development of comparative policy analysis" (Alcock & Oakley, 2001, p. 2). Titmuss provides an analytical framework to the field of social work, not only when social workers work with problems on poverty and inequality in the community but also when they engage in issues of redistribution in the society. For example, Titmuss asked three questions which social workers should contemplate in policy analysis : (1) What is the nature of the entitlement to use? (2) Who is entitled and on what conditions? (3) What methods, financial and administrative, are employed in the determination of access, utilization, allocation and payment? (Titmuss, 1968). Titmuss's ideas and analysis were taken up and have been developed by scholars in the United States such as Martin Rein, S. M. Miller, Alvin Schorr, and Hugh Heclo (Alcock & Oakley, 2001).

### **Assumptions**

#### **Lobbying**

The lobbying model assumes that interest groups play a major role in shaping public policy in the policy-making process. Interest groups have a presence in the political arena and an influence on political decision makers. According to Teater's (2009) definition, interest groups are organizations "whose members tend to agree on public problems and solutions, whose work involves educating and informing political decision makers on the defined problems and solutions, and whose goal is to persuade the decision makers to politically act in the group's favor" (pp. 70-71).

One of the essential dimensions of the influence on interest groups is whether their demands are seen as legitimate by other actors in the policy process. As Hays (2001) notes, it is fundamental to the notion of the representative government that interest groups "can bring their problems to the attention of those with the authority to make decisions, and that they can compel the government to act on these problems if they can convince a majority of the representative body that their request is justified" (p. 4).

On the other hand, it is assumed in the lobbying model that the dominance of any single group would tend to break down the pluralistic concept of group democracy through the long history of the American system of group democracy (Monsen & Cannon, 1965). Furthermore, it is presumed that "the dominance of any one group would not radically change the political assumption of representative government for the country" (Monsen & Cannon, 1965, p. 310).

Although there are some arguments about the effectiveness of interest groups, involvement in interest groups enable social workers to decide their level of political participation and it “allows social workers to actively participate in policy process with other individuals who hold the same political interests” (Teater, 2009, p. 84).

In addition, the lobbying model embraces a basic assumption that social change can be achieved by influencing social policy through lobbying in the field of social work. To underpin lobbying by social workers, Haynes and Michelson (2010) present three models of social action : citizen social worker, agent of social change, and actionist. First, citizen social worker sees the problems such as civil rights, expansion of social programs, or international peace as a concerned citizen, not as a professional obligation. Second, agent of social change aims to achieve desirable social goals using well-developed and well-formulated theoretical systems as guides to action. Third, the actionist presumes that social change for disenfranchised groups can be achieved only by developing and using political, economic, and social pressure.

Although some social workers may refuse to participate in what may be viewed as selfish, untruthful, or conflicting practices by their involvement in interest groups, the lobbying model assumes that “lobbying is a legitimate, fundamental, and powerful practice in a pluralistic society and that social workers and their clients will continue to lose politically if they do not enter this arena” (Haynes & Michelson, 2010, p. 109).

### **Policy Analysis**

There are different sets of assumptions in policy analysis because of the interdisciplinary development of the field. However, the mainstream policy analysis subsumes the notion of rationality in policy formation and implementation. According to DiNitto (2011), the rational approach assumes that (1) the values of society as a whole can be known and weighed, (2) it requires information about alternative policies and the capacity to accurately predict the consequences of each alternative, (3) the ratio of costs to benefits for each policy alternative must be calculated correctly, and (4) policy makers must choose the policy that maximizes net values.

On the other hand, the basic assumption of rationality was often criticized by political and social scientists. For example, Herbert Simon (1997), who studied under Lasswell at the University of Chicago and who later won the Nobel Prize in economics, argued that the need for an administrative theory exists due to the fact that there are practical limits to human rationality. He stressed that these limits are “not static, but depend upon the organizational environment in which the individual’s decisions take place” (Simon, 1997, p. 322). Even though policy formation is not usually a rational process, rationalism seeks to approach an ideal model of policy-making.

Policy analysis holds another assumption that conflict over the allocation of values and resources in society is central to politics and policy-making (DiNitto, 2011). Lasswell (1936) defined politics as the process of determining “who gets what, when, and how” in a society. It is an activity through which individuals and interest groups struggle to acquire scarce resources such



as wealth, status, higher education, and welfare. In this assumption, an essential role of government is to regulate conflict, since conflict will occur naturally over how society should use these limited resources. Governments would act for a resolution by (1) establishing and enforcing general rules if conflicts persist, (2) arranging compromises and balance interests in public policy, and (3) imposing settlements that the parties in a dispute must accept (DiNitto, 2011). Although most of the mainstream models of policy analysis were developed under the assumption of rationalism, the conflict in politics also provides a frame to see how actors play their roles in the policy-making process.

## Paradigms

### Lobbying

Kuhn (1996) defines a paradigm as “what the members of a scientific community share, and, conversely, a scientific community consists of men who share a paradigm” (p. 176). Social work lobbyists are required to work for their clients in the paradigm in a scientific community of policy process. Social workers, especially those who advocate for an oppressed population, would confront the dominant paradigm which was inspired by John Lock who said that the purpose of government is to secure the natural right of individuals to enjoy their property. In conjunction with the capitalist economic system, “the Lockean paradigm of limited government was interpreted that government should not interfere with the market’s allocation of goods and services and should not attempt to ameliorate the substantial inequalities of wealth generated by the market” (Hays, 2001, p. 5).

Although the Lockean paradigm is prevalent in the political arena, pressures brought about by interest groups with different ideologies shape the direction of public policy. In the early decades of the twentieth century, Arthur Bentley, who studied with Georg Simmel in Germany and later wrote with John Dewey (1949), presented the essential role of interest groups in the political process. He emphasized that all politics and all governments are the result of the activities of groups in the policy-making process. Social Darwinism by Herbert Spencer which focuses on individualism also strongly influences policies directly related to governmental interventions. Bentley criticized Spencer’s viewpoint in *The Process of Government : A Study of Social Pressures* (1908) stating that :

Spencer did not learn to know the relation of the individual to society from his life-long study of social facts..... [individual’s desire and satisfaction] are not two separate things capable of reciprocal action on one another, then Spencer’s interpretation of social life stands not merely as false, but as a bald, assumption, without any effort to prove it. (pp. 38-39)

Instead, Bentley explained individual’s desire and satisfaction by the activities of interest groups in the policy-making process. Although subsequent scholars have tried to modify or dismiss his total reliance on interest groups as the driving force in policy process, it is said that “a generally agreed-upon paradigm for the overall role of such groups has yet to emerge” (Hays,

2001, p. 6).

### **Policy Analysis**

Wagenaar and Cook (2003) note that policy analysis has been brought about by “the unstable, ideology-driven and conflict-ridden world of politics under the rule of rational, scientifically derived knowledge” (p. 139). In addition, O'Connor and Netting (2008) note that policy analysis is “based on different sets of assumptions or ideologies.....on different paradigmatic perspectives” (p. 164) because of its multidisciplinary origin. However, most of the mainstream models of policy analysis were developed under the influence of the utilitarianism paradigm which was derived from Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill.

Influenced by Hobbes' account of human nature and Hume's account of social utility, Bentham became the founding figure of utilitarianism. He sought to secure the principle of “the greatest good for the greatest number” (Bentham, 1970/1789). This notion was further developed by J. S. Mill who succeeded the utilitarian tradition after Bentham (Lejano, 2006). The utilitarianism became a dominant paradigm in policy analysis, partly because economics became the most influential discipline as policy analysis was evolving. According to Sen (2009), utilitarians “saw no great difficulty in asserting that the ranking of social goodness and the selection of what is to be chosen must be done simply on the basis of the sum total of individual welfares” (p. 277).

Lejano (2006) presents that the following central notions are influential in policy analysis today, stemming from traditional utilitarian thought :

1. The basic unit of analysis is the individual, and knowledge is arrived at by the individual.
2. The basis for morality is reason, and social questions can be treated as exercises in reason.
3. Individuals tend toward seeking individual utility.
4. Society can be treated, analytically, by understanding it as a collection of individuals.
5. Scientific empiricism can be brought to bear on social questions. (p. 25)

Few scholars and researchers mention the presence of Social Darwinism in the scientific community of policy analysis. However, utilitarianism had a reciprocal relationship with Social Darwinism. Being influenced by utilitarianism, Charles Darwin understood that the greatest happiness principle will naturally come to be regarded as a standard for right and wrong by social instincts (Darwin, 2004/1879). Similarly, Herbert Spencer believed in the theory of hedonistic utilitarianism promoted by Bentham and J. S. Mill and tried to integrate Darwinism and utilitarianism into Social Darwinism. Although both the rationalist and empiricist schools have been developing systematic systems of philosophy (Lejano, 2006), the utilitarian paradigm is still prevalent in policy analysis today.

### **Chaos Theory**

Chaos theory is defined as “a collection of conceptual, mathematical, and geometric techniques that allow one to understand complex systems characterized by periodic, nonlinear,

dynamic, and transitional elements” (Hudson, 2010, p. 27). The lobbying model, in general, does not embrace the chaos theory. Hugh Heclo, a social policy scholar who was supported as a postgraduate student by Titmuss at the London School of Economics, challenged the conventional model of interest group politics, such as the iron triangle model which suggests that policy might emerge from a deal cut by a lobbyist, a committee chair, and a regulatory official (Hula, 1999). Heclo (1978) introduced the concept of “issue networks” and stressed complexities in policy process. In contrast to the traditional policy approaches, Heclo’s description of issue networks is a theory of non-structure for interest group interaction, “featuring as atomistic view of interest group as a set of independent actors who interact unpredictably on the basis of shared expertise and knowledge about issues” (Hula, 1999, p. 4). The non-structured relationships in complex issue networks can include individuals, organizations, lobbyists, legislators, or whoever plays a role in the policy process (Eppel, 2009 ; Hays, 2001 ; Walker, 1991).

Similarly to the development of the lobbying model, the goal of policy analysis is historically not congruent with the chaos theory. As Wagenaar and Cook (2003) state, the aim of policy analysis is “to eliminate the ambiguity, uncertainty, and unpredictability of the everyday world, by bringing it under the command of general, systematic, means-end, foundational knowledge” (p. 140). Likewise O’Connor and Netting (2008) mention that the traditional positivistic thought in policy analysis “favor a functionalist, rational, linear approach to analysis through carefully defined variables, specifically stated questions, and data collection mechanisms based on the belief that it is possible to predict and control events” (p. 166).

Although the dominant paradigm in policy analysis has forced analysts to seek order and control in their policy options, a few researchers attempted to develop new directions for analysis that explicitly bring complexity back into policy analysis. Influenced by the growing field of studies in complex theory, for instance, Lejano (2006) explores a framework for policy analysis which embraces complex systems. He states that an “analyst should endeavor a return to complexity because the reality being studied is fundamentally complex” (p. 14) since complex systems are difficult to capture within a rational and predictable model.

### **Theoretical Foundation**

#### **Lobbying**

The pluralist theory is one of the influential political theories in the lobbying model. Especially, the early development of group theory by Bentley (1908) made a significant contribution to the lobbying model. Bentley’s theory observes that the interactions of groups are the basis of political processes and assumes that group activity determines legislation, administration and adjudication. His ideas of process-based behaviorism later became one of the bases of political science (Ward, 1978). His theory also stresses that social movements are brought about by group interaction and it has a basic feature of the contemporary pluralist theory. Bentley argued that all political activities consist of various groups competing one another, and

collaborating with each other. For Bentley, a group was a way of action in which many people participate in the process. The pluralist theory emphasizes that in order to have influence, a group must (1) be aware of their interests and (2) be willing to organize around those interests. It also sees the outcomes of the group struggles representing the most genuine approximation of the public interest (Hays, 2001).

Marxist theory would see that the political decision-making process is dominated by corporate interests because of the powerful lobbying and the tight connections between big corporations and elected officials. Marx stated that the increasing impoverishment of the vast majority of the population would be the engine driving the revolutionary organization of the proletariat, leading to the eventual overthrow of the capitalist system (Hays, 2001). Marxist theory views society as a history of class struggles between economic classes who pursue their economic interests. Society evolves from one stage to the next by means of class struggles and the struggle is inevitable in Marxist theory (Humphreys, 2011).

Marxist theory gives a foundation to see lobbying by making the “distinction between the few who own the means of production and the vast majority who are dependent on them for employment” (Hays, 2001, p.47). For example, lobbying by a powerful interest group such as the American Legislative Exchange Council has continued to be influential in state and federal legislation than the one by the have-nots (McIntire, 2012). As Reisch and Garvin (2016) note, Marx’s “assessment of how structural conditions produce and sustain injustice is still valid today” (p. 9), especially in macro practice. The Marxist theory would also provide a theoretical framework regarding how the have-nots engage in lobbying to leverage their collectiveness against the haves in order to act for their well-being.

### **Policy Analysis**

Intertwined with multiple disciplines such as policy science, economics, or sociology, not a single theory has had a major impact on the development of policy analysis. In the early formation of policy science, for example, Lasswell learned from Dewey’s philosophy of pragmatism, G. H. Mead’s symbolic interaction theory, and Freudian psychoanalysis in a highly interdisciplinary environment at the University of Chicago. In addition, Lasswell’s work on promoting policy orientation in the context of historical change is profoundly indebted to a view of history advanced in Marxian theory (Torgerson, 2007).

In the field of economics, both John Maynard Keynes and Milton Friedman’s theories greatly contributed to the development of policy analysis. Keynes viewed governmental fiscal policy as the best means to eliminate unemployment. In response to the severe unemployment in the 1930s, he promoted government taxation and public employment to alter the distribution of income by income transfers from the wealthy to the poor (Prigoff, 2000). Keynes’ economic theory provided “framers of public fiscal policy an alternative to *laissez-faire* economics, so government could choose to intervene in the business cycle and to plan for economic recovery, rather than

wait for the market to self-regulate a return to market equilibrium” (Prigoff, 2000, p. 72).

On the contrary, Friedman rejected the government’s role in the redistribution of income and wealth. He argued that the only true role for the government in relation to the economy was to provide a stable framework for a free market economy (Humphreys, 2011). According to Friedman’s economic theory, the market is self-regulating by an invisible hand. The policy choice of government would be the control of the quantity of money by minimizing social spending, tax reductions for the wealthy and corporate sectors, and the deregulation of interest rates (Prigoff, 2000). Friedman (1953) stressed “the economic hypothesis that under a wide range of circumstances individual firms behave *as if* they were seeking rationally to maximize their expected returns.....and had full knowledge of the data needed to succeed in this attempt” (p. 21). Friedman’s theory continues to be influential not only among neo-liberal economists but also among policy analysts who embrace the rational choice theory.

Rational choice theory has made a significant contribution to the development of policy analysis. It seeks to generate a predictive and universal explanation of the policy process from a set of parsimonious assumptions that privilege the instrumental actions of individual policy actors (Griggs, 2007). Rational individuals are characterized as those who, “when faced with distinct courses of action or policy options, choose the feasible course of action, which is most likely to maximize their own utility” (Griggs, 2007, p. 174). In this sense, rational choice theory is congruent with the utilitarian paradigm in policy analysis. On the other hand, rational utility-maximizing individuals will deliver collectively unintentional outcomes or socially irrational outcomes as Hardin (1969) demonstrates in *The Tragedy of the Commons*.

Some policy analysts rely on institutional rational choice theory which emphasizes the role of institutions. Caputo (2014) explains the institutional rational choice theory from four levels of rules : operational, collective choice, constitutional, and meta-constitutional level. Although the rational choice theory has been criticized by opponents such as Green and Shapiro (1994) because it was founded upon explicitly unrealistic and inadequately tested assumptions, it is still the main theory in the dominant school of microeconomics and public policy and also used as a stringent theory to explain individual’s social and economic behavior.

### **Epistemological and Empirical Considerations**

According to Campbell (1988), epistemology deals with problems of knowing. More specifically, it covers “psychological hypotheses as to how we know – how we see, or learn, and sociological hypotheses as to how we share and edit beliefs to achieve science and other socially shared beliefs of possible validity” (Campbell, 1988, p. 440). Throughout the history of epistemology, there has been the debate between empiricists and rationalists (Hudson, 2010). Empiricists emphasize observational knowledge, whereas “rationalists emphasize the use of logic and reason to derive statements about the world that are consistent with one another” (Hudson, 2010, p. 90). As for the policy practice method, Anderson (2006) provides a useful approach to

examine epistemological and empirical considerations in lobbying and policy analysis in relation to social worker's worldview and value stance by three epistemologies : positivism, interpretive, and critical perspective.

Positivism is a dominant epistemology in social policy and it applies to policy analysis as well. It assumes that a policy analyst can best comprehend, evaluate, and explain the world through objective observations (Anderson, 2006). In addition, positivists view people as "rational, self-interested actors who are largely shaped by external forces" (Anderson, 2006, p. 9). It also requires a policy analyst to be value neutral in order not to distort the reality. Although the lobbying model partly shares the feature as a self-interested actor in policy process, positivism would be less prevalent in lobbying than in policy analysis.

Interpretive perspective assumes that social reality is not external to people, but rather influences and is influenced by the interactions between individuals and their environments (Anderson, 2006). Furthermore, it presupposes that "understanding cannot be gained unless one considers the meanings that the actors attach to their situations, their own actions, and actions of others" (p. 10). As Bentley (1908) explained an individual's desire and satisfaction by the activities of groups in policy process, the interpretive perspective would fit more into the lobbying model than in policy analysis model.

The third epistemology, critical perspective, would provide a direction to both lobbying and policy analysis if the goal of the social work lobbyist or policy analyst is to change policies. Built upon the Marxist theory, it focuses on the effects that power and inequality have on those who are marginalized (Anderson, 2006). Moreover, it aims to "reveal society for what it is in order to lay the foundation for human emancipation through social change" (p. 11). As Pease (2010) notes, epistemology in social work is "located in the wider divisions between positivists/objectivists and interpretivists/subjectivists about the nature of social reality" (p. 103). Social workers who engage in lobbying or policy analysis should transcend the limitation of the positivists/objectivists and interpretivists/subjectivists dichotomies.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

In this paper, lobbying and policy analysis were examined and compared in terms of history, assumptions, paradigms, theoretical foundation, and epistemological and empirical considerations. Both lobbying and policy analysis provide unique and useful tools for social workers to pursue social justice for their clients, especially for the oppressed population. On the other hand, the two models have been developed under different histories, paradigms, and epistemologies. Like other models in policy practice methods, both lobbying and policy analysis are still controversial and not widely recognized as practice models because of their newness, mixed use of terms, and having little clarity. Furthermore, it is important to note that social workers have always been leery and uncomfortable about being involved in politics (Humphreys, 2012).

As the International Federation of Social Workers states, social workers have a duty to



“bring to the attention of their employers, policymakers, politicians, and the public situations in which policies and resources are inadequate or in which policies and practices are oppressive, unfair, or harmful” (IFSW, 2018). Similarly, the NASW’s Code of Ethics states that social workers have ethical responsibilities to the broader society. For example, social workers “should advocate for changes in policy and legislation to improve social conditions in order to meet basic human needs and promote social justice” (NASW, 2018). Although collective actions such as promotion of the Dorothy I. Height and Whitney M. Young, Jr. Social Work Reinvestment Act has begun through the NASW’s initiative, more social workers should be involved in the policy process.

Both lobbying and policy analysis are social and political activities in terms of their goal achievements which are closely related to decision-making in the fair allocation and distribution of resources within the society. Social workers can make further contributions into bringing about social change for their clients’ well-being by implementing lobbying and policy analysis in the political arena.

### References

- Alcock, P., & Oakley, A. (2001) Introduction. In R. M. Titmuss (edited by Alcock, P., Glennerster, H., Oakley, A., & Sinfield, A.), *Welfare and wellbeing: Richard Titmuss's contribution to social policy* (pp. 1-9). Bristol, UK : Policy Press.
- Anderson, D. K. (2006). Mucking through the swamp : Changing the pedagogy of a social welfare policy course. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 26*, 1-17.
- Barker, R. L. (2003). *The social work dictionary* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC : NASW Press.
- Bentley, A. F. (1908). *The process of government : A study of social pressures*. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press.
- Bentham, J. (edited by J. H. Burns, & H. L. A. Hart). (1970/1789). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Burns, E. (1958). Social welfare is our commitment. *Proceedings of the 85<sup>th</sup> Annual Forum, National Conference on Social Welfare* (pp. 3-19). New York : Columbia University Press.
- Burns, E. (1961). Social policy : The step-child of the curriculum. *Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Program Meeting, Council on Social Work Education*. New York : Council on Social Work Education.
- Campbell, D. T. (1988). Descriptive epistemology: Psychological, sociological, and evolutionary. In D. T. Campbell (edited by Overman, E. S.), *Methodology and epistemology for social science : Selected papers* (pp. 435-486). Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press.
- Caputo, R. K. (2014). *Policy analysis for social workers*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.
- Darwin, C. (2004/1879). *The descent of man*. New York : Penguin Putnum.
- Dewey, J., & Bentley, A. F. (1949). *Knowing and the known*. Boston, MA : Beacon Press.
- DiNitto, D. M. (2011). *Social welfare : Politics and public policy* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA : Allyn and Bacon.

- Einbinder, S. D. (1995). Policy analysis. In R. Edwards (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social work* (19<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 1849-1855). Washington, DC : NASW Press.
- Einbinder, S. D. (2010). Policy Analysis. In B. Thyer (Ed.), *The handbook of social work research methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 527-546). Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.
- Eppel, E. A. (2009). *The contribution of complexity theory to understanding and explaining policy processes : A study of tertiary education policy processes in New Zealand* (Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington). Retrieved on Sep. 9, 2018 from [https://www.victoria.ac.nz/sog/researchcentres/egovt/research-projects/thesis/Elizabeth\\_Eppel\\_Thesis.pdf](https://www.victoria.ac.nz/sog/researchcentres/egovt/research-projects/thesis/Elizabeth_Eppel_Thesis.pdf)
- Figueira-McDonough, J. (1993). Policy practice : The neglected side of social work intervention. *Social Work*, 38, 179-188.
- Fischer, F., Miller, G. J., & Sidney, M. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of public policy analysis : Theory, politics, and methods*. Boca Raton, FL : CRC/Taylor & Francis.
- Franklin, D. L. (1990). The cycles of social work practice : Social action vs. individual interest. *Journal of Progressive human services*, 1, 59-80.
- Friedman, M. (1953). *Essays in Positive Economics*. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press.
- Gitterman, A., & Germain, C. B. (2008). *The life model of social work practice : Advances in theory and practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York : Columbia University Press.
- Green, D. P., & Shapiro, I. (1994). *Pathologies of rational choice theory : A critique of applications in political science*. New Haven, CT : Yale University Press.
- Griggs, S. (2007). Promoting the policy orientation : Lasswell in context. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis : Theory, politics, and methods* (pp. 173-185). Boca Raton, FL : CRC/Taylor & Francis.
- Grob, G. N. (1983). Historical origins of deinstitutionalization. In L. L. Bachrach (Ed.), *Deinstitutionalization*. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.
- Hardin, G. (1969). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162, 1243-1248.
- Haynes, K. S., & Mickelson, J. S. (2010). *Affecting change : Social workers in the political arena* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA : Allyn and Bacon.
- Hays, R. A. (2001). *Who speaks for the poor? National interest groups and social policy*. New York : Routledge.
- Heclo, H. (1978). Issue networks and the executive establishment. In A. King (Ed.), *The new American political system* (pp. 87-124). Washington, D.C. : American Enterprise Institute.
- Hogwood, B., & Gunn, L. A. (1984). *Policy analysis for the real world*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Holosko, M. J., & Au, E. (1996). Social and public policy analysis : A niche for social work practice. *Journal of Health & Social Policy*, 7, 65-73.
- Hudson, C. G. (2010). *Complex systems and human behavior*. Chicago, IL : Lyceum Books.



- Hula, K. W. (1999). *Lobbying together : Interest group coalitions in legislative politics*. Washington, D.C. : Georgetown University Press.
- Humphreys, N. A. (2011). *Social and behavioral science : The knowledge base for macro social work practice lecture notes*. Personal communication, School of Social Work, University of Connecticut, West Hartford, CT.
- Humphreys, N. A. (2012). *Comparative social work practice models : Macro practice lecture notes*. Personal communication, School of Social Work, University of Connecticut, West Hartford, CT.
- International Federation of Social Workers. (2018). *Global Social Work Statement of Ethical Principles*. Retrieved Sep. 9, 2018, from <https://www.ifsw.org/global-social-work-statement-of-ethical-principles/>
- Jansson, B. S. (2003). *Becoming an effective policy advocate : From policy practice to social justice* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pacific Grove, CA : Brooks/Cole.
- Jansson, B. S. (2005). *The Reluctant welfare state : American social welfare policies – past, present, and future* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA : Brooks/Cole.
- Josephson, H. (1974). *Jeannette Rankin : First lady in congress*. New York : Bobbs-Merrill.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1936). *Politics : Who gets what, when, how*. New York : The Free Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1971). *A pre-view of policy sciences*. New York : American Elsevier.
- Lejano, R. P. (2006). *Frameworks for policy analysis : Merging text and context*. New York : Routledge.
- Lerner, D., & Lasswell, H. D. (Eds.). (1951). *The policy sciences : recent developments in scope and method*. Stanford, CA : Stanford University Press.
- Linhorst, D. M. (2002). Federalism and social justice : Implications for social work. *Social Work*, 47, 201–208.
- McIntire, M. (2012, April 21). Conservative nonprofit acts as a stealth business lobbyist. *The New York Times*. Retrieved Sep. 9, 2018, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/22/us/alec-a-tax-exempt-group-mixes-legislators-and-lobbyists.html>
- Monsen, R. J., & Cannon, M. W. (1965). *The makers of public policy : American power groups and their ideologies*. New York : McGraw-Hill.
- National Association of Social Workers (2018). *Code of ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Retrieved Sep. 9, 2018, from <https://www.socialworkers.org/About/Ethics/Code-of-Ethics/Code-of-Ethics-English>
- O'Connor, M. K. & Netting, F. E. (2008). Teaching policy analysis as research : Consideration and extension of options. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44, 159–172.
- Pardeck, J. T., & Meinert, R. (1994). Do social workers have a major impact on social policy? In H.

- J. Karger, & J. Midgley (Eds.), *Controversial issues in social policy* (pp. 93-106). Needham Heights, MA : Allyn and Bacon.
- Pease, B. (2010). Challenging the dominant paradigm : Social work research, social justice, and social change. In I. Shaw, K. Briar-Lawson, J. Orme, & R. Ruckdeschel (Eds.), *Sage handbook of social work research* (pp. 98-112). Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.
- Prigoff, A. (2000). *Economics for social workers : Social outcomes of economic globalization with strategies for community action*. Belmont, CA : Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Reisch, M., & Andrews, J. (2001). *The Road not taken : A history of radical social work in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA : Brunner-Routledge.
- Reisch, M., & Garvin, C. D. (2016). *Social work and social justice : Concepts, challenges, and strategies*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Richan, W. C. (1987). *Beyond altruism : Social welfare policy in American society*. New York : Haworth Press.
- Rome, S. H., & Kiser, S. (2017). Lobbying. In *Encyclopedia of social work online*. Oxford. doi : 10.1093/acrefore/9780199975839.013.974
- Schneider, R. L., & Netting, F. E. (1999). Influencing social policy in a time of devolution : Upholding social work's great tradition. *Social Work*, 44, 349-357.
- Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Cambridge, MA : Belknap Press.
- Shlakman, V. (1969). Eveline M. Burns : Social economist. In S. Jenkins (Ed.), *Social security in international perspective : Essays in honor of Eveline M. Burns* (pp. 3-25). New York : Columbia University Press.
- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior : A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York : The Free Press.
- Smith, N. (2002). *Jeannette Rankin : America's conscience*. Helena, MT : Montana Historical Society Press.
- Specht, H. (1976). The deprofessionalization of social work. In N. Gilbert, & H. Specht (Eds.), *The emergence of social welfare and social work* (pp. 484-503). Itasca, IL : F. E. Peacock Publishers.
- Teater, B. (2009). Influencing state legislators : A framework for developing effective social work interest groups. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 8, 69-86.
- Titmuss, R. M. (1968). *Commitment to welfare*. New York : Pantheon Books.
- Torgerson, D. (2007). Promoting the policy orientation : Lasswell in context. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis : Theory, politics, and methods* (pp. 15-28). Boca Raton, FL : CRC/Taylor & Francis.
- Trattner, W. I. (1999). *From poor law to welfare state : A history of social welfare in America* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York : Free Press.
- Wagenaar, H., & Cook, S. D. N. (2003). Understanding policy practices : Action, dialectic and

deliberation in policy analysis. In M. A. Hajer, & H. Wagennar (Eds.), *Deliberative policy analysis : Understanding governance in the network society* (pp. 139-171). New York : Cambridge University Press.

Walker, J. L., Jr. (1991). *Mobilizing interest groups in America : Patrons, professions, and social movements*. Ann Arbor, MI : University of Michigan Press.

Ward, J. F. (1978). Arthur F. Bentley's philosophy of social science. *American Journal of Political Science*, 22, 595-608.